PATENT COOPERATION TREATY



From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITI	PUI			
To: ROBINS & PASTERNAK LLP Attn. Pasternak, Dahna 1731 Embarcadero Road, Suite 230 Palo Alto CA 94303 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	ak, Dahna lero Road, Suite 230 94303 OF AMERICA (PCT Article 17(3)(a) and Rule 40.1)			
RECEIVED NOV 2 9 2004	Date of mailing (day/month/year) 22/11/2004			
Applicant's or agent's file reference ROBINS & PASTERNAN LE.	PAYMENT DUE within 45 MONTES / days from the above date of mailing			
International application No. PCT/US 03/38158	International filing date (day/month/year) 25/11/2003			
Applicant				
IMAGING THERAPEUTICS, INC.				
This International Searching Authority (i) considers that there are 5 (number of the claims indicated MANN/on the extra sheet: and it considers that the international application does not (Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3) for the reasons indicated beach.	niber of) inventions claimed in the international application covered to the comply with the requirements of unity of invention with the extra sheet:			
(ii) X has carried out a partial international search (see An on those parts of the international application which relate see annex (iii) will establish the international search report on the other production to which, additional fees are paid	to the invention first mentioned in claims Nos.:			
2. The applicant is hereby invited, within the time limit indicated	rentions total amount of additional fees =			
Article 17(2)(0) Decause of detects under Article 17(2)(a)	and therefore maye not been thanked with any arrendor.			
Name and mailing address of the International Searching Authority European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,	Authorized officer Raoul Emme			

Anra to Form PCT/ISA/206 COMMUNICA AN RELATING TO THE RESULTS OF THE PARTIAL INTERNATIONAL SEARCH

nternational Application No PCT/US 03/38158

- 1. The present communication is an Annex to the invitation to pay additional fees (Form PCT/ISA/206). It shows the results of the international search established on the parts of the international application which relate to the invention first mentioned in claims Nos.:
- see 'Invitation to pay additional fees' 2. This communication is not the international search report which will be established according to Article 18 and Rule 43.
- 3.If the applicant does not pay any additional search fees, the information appearing in this communication will be considered as the result of the international search and will be included as such in the international search report.
- 4.If the applicant pays additional fees, the international search report will contain both the information appearing in this communication and the results of the international search on other parts of the international application for which such fees will have been paid.

C. DOCUME	ENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT		Relevant to claim No.
Category °	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of th	e relevant passages	Melevant to dains inc.
х	WO 02/22014 A (ANDRIACCHI THOM LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR (US); S DAVID) 21 March 2002 (2002-03- cited in the application page 41 - page 42	SICINES	1-4
x	PHIDIAS NEWSLETTER NO 6 - RAPI PROTOTYPING IN MEDECINE, 'Onlid June 2001 (2001-06), pages 1-8 XP002304725 EDITOR N MOOS DANISH, TECHNOLO INSTITUTE TEKNOLOGIPARKEN, AAR Retrieved from the Internet: URL:http://www.materialise.com es/ph6.pdf> 'retrieved on 2004 pages 3, 6-7 (article "Modeling")!" by Taha et al.)	ine! 3, DGICAL RHUS, DK n/medical/fil 4-11-08!	1-4
X .	KIDDER J ET AL: "3D model accidesign, planning and manufacts orthopaedic devices: a framework PROCEEDINGS OF THE SPIE - ADVAND CONTROL-SYSTEM INTERFACE, USA, vol. 2911, 21 November 1996 (pages 9-22, XP008038390 ISSN: 0277-786X section 4.2	uring of ork" ANCED SENSOR BOSTON, MA,	1-4
X Fur	ther documents are listed in the continuation of box C.	Patent family members are list	ed in annex.
"A" docum cons "E" earlier filing "L" docum which citati	eategories of cited documents: nent defining the general state of the art which is not idered to be of particular relevance r document but published on or after the International date nent which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or h is cited to establish the publication date of another on or other special reason (as specified) nent referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or r means	"T" later document published after the to or priority date and not in conflict wited to understand the principle of invention." "X" document of particular relevance; it cannot be considered novel or car involve an inventive step when the "Y" document of particular relevance; it cannot be considered to involve as document is combined with one of ments, such combination being of in the art.	win the application but r theory underlying the not be considered to document is taken alone ne claimed invention ne claimed invention r more other such docu-

1

Anrax to Form PCT/ISA/206 COMMUNIC. IN RELATING TO THE RESULTS OF THE PARTIAL INTERNATIONAL SEARCH

nternational Application No
PCT/US 03/38158

	ation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT	Relevant to claim No.
Category °	Citation of document, with Indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	nelevant to Gain No.
х	CARR J C ET AL: "SURFACE INTERPOLATION WITH RADIAL BASIS FUNCTIONS FOR MEDICAL IMAGING" IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON MEDICAL IMAGING, IEEE INC. NEW YORK, US, vol. 16, no. 1, 1 February 1997 (1997-02-01), pages 96-107, XP000685494 ISSN: 0278-0062 abstract	1-4
X	US 2002/059049 A1 (BRADBURY THOMAS J ET AL) 16 May 2002 (2002-05-16) paragraph '0057! paragraph '0060! - paragraph '0062! paragraph '0115!	1-4
		·

		٠.

1

INVITATION TO PAY ADDITIONAL FEES

This International Searching Authority found multiple (groups of) inventions in this international application, as follows:

1. claims: 1-4

in the context of designing an articular implant, reconstructing in an image the dimensions of diseased cartilage to correspond to normal cartilage, with a parametric surface

2. claims: 5-7

in the context of designing an articular implant, reconstructing in an image the dimensions of diseased cartilage to correspond to normal cartilage, via a morphological closing operation

3. claims: 8-17, 27-38

evaluating the image-fit of an articular repair system into a joint

4. claims: 18-26, 65-83, 86-102

surgical tool for preparing a joint to receive an implant, the tool comprising one or more surfaces or members that conform to the shape of the articular surfaces of the joint.

5. claims: 40-64

customizable implant configured for placement between joint surfaces

1. Prior art:

Reference is made with D1 to following document cited in the application: 01: W002/22014

D1 discloses claim 1, which is therefore not novel.

In fact, D1 discloses:
a method of designing an articular implant
(see D1, page 41, line 13, to page 42, line 14)
comprising the steps of
- obtaining an image of a joint, wherein the image includes at least one
of normal cartilage and diseased cartilage;
(see D1, page 41, lines 17-21)
- reconstructing dimensions of the diseased cartilage surface to
correspond to normal cartilage;
(see D1 page 41, lines 24-30 and p. 42, lines 7-10)

- and designing the articular implant to match the dimensions of the reconstructed diseased cartilage surface or an area greater than the diseased cartilage surface. (see D1, page 42, lines 7-10)

Concerning claim 2, D1 discloses the additional feature of claim 2 of the image being an MRI-image (see D1, page 41, lines 17-21). Claim 2 is therefore not novel

Moreover, the other imaging modalities recited in claim 2 are standard in the field of medical imaging, and the skilled person would implement the method of claim 1 to images of these modalities without the exercise of inventive skills. Two of these alternative imaging modalities, namely CT and ultrasound, are cited also in D1 as examples of alternative imaging modalities (see D1, p.21, lines 11-15). Claim 2 as a whole is therefore not taken into consideration in the assessment of the special technical features (STF) of the alleged inventions.

2. Special technical features (STF) and associated objective problems:

2.1 First subject: The STF of the first subject consist in the features of claim 3. The objective problem solved by these features with respect to D1, regards the improvement of reconstruction of cartilage in an image.

2.2 Second subject: The STF of the second subject consist in the features of claim 5. The objective problem solved by these features with respect to D1, regards the improvement of reconstruction of cartilage in an image.

2.3 Third subject: The STF of the third subject consist in the features of claim 8. The objective problem solved by these features with respect to D1, regards the quality check and the optimal choice of the implant.

2.4 Fourth subject: The STF of the fourth subject consist in the features of claim 18. The objective problem solved by these features with respect to D1, regards providing a surgical tool for preparing a joint to receive an implant.

2.5 Fifth subject: The STF of the fifth subject consist in the features of claim 40 or 41. The objective problem solved by these features with respect to D1, regards the construction of a joint implant.

3. Conclusion:

The STF of the different subjects are obviously not the same, and can be implemented independently from each other. Moreover, the objective problems, when compared in a pairwise manner, don't show any correspondence allowing to identify a common general inventive concept. This applies in particular to the common problem of the first and the second subject, which is of obvious nature (improvement of a feature of D1) and is the basis for two completely independent alternative

PCT/US 03/38158

solutions.
The application therefore does not comply with the requirements of Rule 13 PCT.

4. Additional remark:

The application relates to a plurality of inventions, or groups of inventions, in the sense of Rule 13.1 PCT. They have been divided as defined above. If the applicant pays additional fees for one (or more) not yet searched group(s) of invention(s), then the further search(es) may reveal further prior art that gives evidence of a further lack of unity 'a posteriori' within one (or more) of the not yet searched group(s). In such a case only the first invention in this (each of these) group(s) of inventions, which is considered to lack unity of invention, will be the subject of a search. No further invitation to pay further additional fees will be issued. This is because Article 17(3)(a) PCT stipulates that the ISA shall establish the International Search Report on those parts of the international application which relate to the invention first mentioned in the claims ('main invention') and for those parts which relate to inventions in respect of which the additional fees were paid. Neither the PCT nor the PCT guidelines provide a legal basis for further invitations to pay further additional search fees (W17/00, point 11 and W1/97, points 11-16).

FURTHER INFORMATION CONTINUED FROM PCT/ISA/ 206

Continuation of Box 3.

Claim(s) not searched: 39, 84-85

Rule 39.1(iv) PCT - Method for treatment of the human or animal body by surgery

Patent Family Annex

..ormation on patent family members

nternational Application No PCT/US 03/38158

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date		Patent family member(s)	Publication date
WO 0222014	A	21-03-2002	AU CA EP WO US	9088801 A 2425120 A1 1322225 A1 0222014 A1 2004167390 A1	26-03-2002 21-03-2002 02-07-2003 21-03-2002 26-08-2004
US 2002059049	A1	16-05-2002	US AU EP WO	2002007294 A1 4993501 A 1312025 A2 0177988 A2	17-01-2002 23-10-2001 21-05-2003 18-10-2001